

**Technology Customer Council Meeting**  
**Minutes of May 13, 2008**

1:00 p.m.

Hoover, A Level, Conference Room 7

**Final**

Present: Greg Wright, Steve Mosena, Evelyn Halterman, Rich Jacobs, Lesa Quinn, Larry Murphy, Roberta Polzin, Gary Kendell

Absent: Kevin VandeWall, Joel Lunde, Keith Greiner, Mark Brandsgard

Guests: John Gillispie, Laura Riordan, John Hove, Diane Van Zante, Lorrie Tritch, Greg Fay, Michael Tutty, Lana Morrissey, Patsy Tallman

1) **Call to Order** – Greg Wright.

Greg Wright, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:01 p.m. It was noted that a quorum of members was in attendance.

2) **Approve Minutes of April 28, 2008** – Greg Wright.

Larry Murphy moved approval of the April 28, 2008 meeting minutes; Rich Jacobs seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken, unanimously approving the minutes as written.

3) **Preliminary Budgets for FY10 Utilities**

(a) Common Directory – Lorrie Tritch.

The financial reports are preliminary, so the budget is in draft form. The budget assumes use of the most recent quarter count for FTEs and management of all costs of the directory services utility through the ITE operating fund. The budget also reflects ITE's new service rates which will be effective on July 1<sup>st</sup>; the new rates have not yet been approved, so all figures are preliminary at this point in time.

Total utility budgeted expenses for FY10 are \$157,142.22. For FY09, the Council approved \$3500.00 for RDirectory application development and maintenance; nothing has been included for FY10 at the present time.

Utilizing the existing figures, the proposed FY10 rate is 58 cents per month/\$6.96 per year per person. By comparison, the rate for FY09 is 66 cents per month/\$7.88 per year.

Is there a balance carry forward from FY08 to FY09? Yes, about \$10,000-\$12,000.

No action is required today. Council members have the opportunity over the next few weeks to visit with their counterparts and seek feedback.

(b) Information Security Office (ISO) – Greg Fay.

The budget for the Information Security Office utility stayed pretty much the same; salaries went up, training was reduced a bit. The vast majority of the budget is for two staff persons and support of those individuals. There is a small amount set aside for hosting. Council members asked for a current list of tasks and accomplishments. Greg will follow-up on that request. Is the Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship the only agency to opt out of the ISO utility? Yes, however we still hope to persuade them and also plan to talk with the agencies that by code are not required to participate.

The proposed FY10 rate is \$1.24 per month/\$14.89 per year per person. By comparison, the rate for FY09 is \$1.37 per month/\$16.49 per year.

No action is required today. Historically, council members have sought feedback and shared any comments at the June meeting, before the Council takes initial action on proposed rates. A conference call may need to be scheduled prior to the regular June meeting to discuss final budget figures.

**4) Continued Discussion of New Utilities – John Gillispie.**

At the April meeting, three items were discussed as potential new utilities: 1) SOA Shared Infrastructure, 2) Authentication and Authorization (A & A), and 3) E-Payment. The decision has been made not to pursue the E-payment utility; there is not adequate time to resolve the debate between agencies who collect money and those who don't.

The two utilities that remain do not have global support. A & A was proposed as a utility because it is customer friendly; it seeks to provide a single method (one log-on) for citizens to do business across multiple agencies within state government. While the goal is worthwhile, there is a lot of debate about how it should be implemented.

SOA Architecture allows us to begin to move to a real time environment to exchange data. This is also valuable. Feedback on this potential utility has generally been favorable.

The idea of a variable model, one with a flat fee structure and also a component based on use, seems to be gaining acceptance.

John would like to move forward with the SOA and A & A utilities. If people are supportive of the idea, John will make a recommendation to the Governor to create new utilities; if there is clear disagreement, he won't. IWD opposes A & A, while DOT is in favor, with some caveats.

Is it important that these utilities be rolled out this year? If we postpone the start date, it will be FY11 or FY12 before they take effect. It is important to get a centralized functionality in place so that people will use it.

**5) Draft Magnitude of Cost for New Utilities**

A & A – The base cost of the A & A utility is \$150,000-\$160,000.

Discussion by the Council:

- \$160,000 is not a significant amount of money; how much work do we want to put into cost allocation when the amount is fairly small?
- A utility is supposed to be where we go to get the service – a number of agencies have invested heavily in A & A models in their applications. Are we going to require them to pull out the previous A & A models, are we going to grandfather those applications in, or are we saying that you don't have to use it, but you still have to pay for it?
- Some council members support implementation on an FTE basis rather than a utilization basis.
- DHS is supportive of the concept of A & A, but it must work for the kind of business an agency is in. Some DHS clients have a different environment than employees do. One model won't fit everyone.
- IWD has customers that pay quarterly; if they are required to change passwords every 60 days, that will be a problem.
- Who is taking the risk? There are different levels of security that agencies practice. Some have the need for a high level of security; others don't. From a practical perspective, how do you get an A & A engine to deal with multiple levels of complexity for the same person?
- The highest level of security in A & A is whatever the department/agency requires. The agency needs to make that decision.
- Why don't you make it a marketplace service and let agencies choose whether they want to use it or not?
- The benefit doesn't accrue to the citizen. The only way the benefit accrues to the citizen is if all of the agencies use it.
- If something is a utility, do you have to use it or can you simply pay for it, but still contract for your own service? After some deliberation on this question, council members revisited the definition of a utility and concluded that you must use it.
- Why don't we make it a totally utilization based service?

#### SOA Infrastructure –

##### Discussion by the Council:

- Calculations are based on a lights-on cost plus a utilization fee per dip.
- Who pays? The dipper or the dipee?
- It depends on whether we acquire new boxes or use the CJIS boxes.
- Michael Tutty would appreciate agencies providing rough numbers of transactions going through the gateway.
- Some directors will not want to share data with other agencies. Some agencies would have no need for a SOA gateway (such as Public Defense).
- Revenue and DHS support making SOA a utility.

What is the next step in proposing new utilities? Up until this point, John has been seeking feedback and trying to get consensus. It sounds like there is stronger support for SOA web services than A & A. Based on the Council's feedback, John will talk with Mollie Anderson and ask her to discuss it with the Governor.

## 6) Discussion of Allocation Methodologies for Common Directory and Information Security Office Utilities

At the April 28, 2008 meeting, the Council voted unanimously to continue use of the existing rate methodology (acceptance of an allocation formula based on FTEs).

7) **Wrap-Up and Next Meeting Date** – Greg Wright.

Effective July 1, the Department of Management will assume responsibility for DAS customer councils. It appears that the four customer councils will merge into a single council. Little else is known at this time.

- The next meeting is June 10 at 1:00 p.m.
- Will be seeking tentative approval of rates at the June meeting, so will need a quorum.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:37 p.m.